

1 other licensed site did you have besides Bay City?

2 THE WITNESS: There were no, and I --

3 JUDGE CHACHKIN: And you were referring, were you
4 not, in the first sentence, the currently operating site.

5 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

6 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Licensed site?

7 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

8 JUDGE CHACHKIN: So wouldn't you have put down the
9 coordinates of your --

10 THE WITNESS: Which I very much --

11 JUDGE CHACHKIN: -- licensed site?

12 THE WITNESS: Which i very much intended to do,
13 Your Honor. I just --

14 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Which you did, the licensed site
15 was Bay City, and these were the coordinates for Bay City?

16 THE WITNESS: No, they were not, sir. These were
17 the coordinates for the proposed STA site.

18 JUDGE CHACHKIN: I see.

19 THE WITNESS: And I might add, though, Mr.
20 Aronowitz, that the Bay City coordinates are a part of the
21 FCC's database, have been since 1946. This was an easily
22 documented error.

23 MR. ARONOWITZ: We will address that, and I will
24 ask questions relative to that.

25 //

1 BY MR. ARONOWITZ:

2 Q But for the time being I would just like to ask so
3 I can get my bearings through these applications. We will
4 get into those questions or what's in the Commission's
5 database or what's in your applications in a minute. But
6 I'm just trying for the moment to just get an understanding
7 of how --

8 A I made a mistake.

9 Q Okay. And we're going to look at that.

10 A And Exhibit --

11 Q We're going to ask a few more questions about
12 this.

13 A And Exhibit E-3, page 1, and E-3, page 2, and E-1,
14 page 1, very clearly demonstrate where 29 38 10 and 95 32 22
15 are.

16 Q I'm going to ask you about that, okay.

17 A Okay.

18 Q Let's go -- I just want to get an understanding
19 because I --

20 A The answer to the question is I made an error.

21 Q Okay.

22 A And it's --

23 Q And so on the next paragraph where it says,
24 "Proposed STA site," there are also some coordinates; is
25 that correct?

1 A Yes, sir.

2 Q And those are the same coordinates as the first
3 paragraph?

4 A They are exactly the same.

5 Q And it's the Harris County site?

6 A Yes, sir.

7 Q And the usage of the coordinates here was correct?

8 A Yes, sir.

9 Q However, reading it on its face it looks like the
10 authorized site and the proposed site --

11 A Are one and the same.

12 Q -- are the same coordinates?

13 A Yes, sir.

14 Q Okay, I just want to check that out.

15 A Which -- again, which clearly points to the fact
16 that I made an error in the first paragraph.

17 Q I think that's clear. Okay, but I want to get an
18 understanding of how this -- how this -- how this
19 misunderstanding or how this error played its way through
20 the application as they are here. I mean, we're not
21 changing anything. We just ask.

22 A Okay.

23 Q Okay. Now, I believe you were -- you mentioned
24 pages E-1, E-5, and I don't recall what you're saying. I'm
25 assuming that these are pages --

1 A Exhibit E-3, page 1 --

2 Q Right, this would be one, two --

3 A -- is a --

4 Q This would be page 5, 6, 7, Exhibit 6 just so
5 we're all on the same page literally.

6 A It is page 6.

7 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Has this been paginated?

8 MR. ARONOWITZ: I believe it's -- no, actually, it
9 has not, Your Honor.

10 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Well, it might help if you
11 paginate it.

12 MR. ARONOWITZ: Absolutely.

13 JUDGE CHACHKIN: So there is no confusion as to
14 what we're talking about here. So why don't you -- what did
15 you want as your first page here?

16 MR. ARONOWITZ: It would be page 1, reflecting the
17 April 21 date.

18 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Page 1 would be what?

19 MR. ARONOWITZ: Would be the cover --

20 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Would be the form?

21 MR. ARONOWITZ: Would be the cover letter
22 reflecting the April 21 date.

23 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Okay. Page 2 is then the FCC
24 processing form.

25 MR. ARONOWITZ: Processing form.

1 JUDGE CHACHKIN: And 3 is?

2 MR. ARONOWITZ: Page 3 would be the first page of
3 the actual request where it says "Before the Federal
4 Communications Commission" on top. The next page would be
5 page 4, which has Mr. Werlinger's signature. Page 5 would
6 be a copy of the fee check. Page 6 would be what is
7 reflected by the facsimile number up at the top as page 6.
8 Page 7, the same way. And page 8 would be -- I think that's
9 a page 8, but it would be Exhibit E-1, page 1. Nine would
10 be the vertical plan sketch. Ten would be a depiction of
11 radials, of reflecting a facsimile page 5 in the upper
12 right-hand corner. And that's it.

13 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Okay, so now what page are you
14 talking about?

15 MR. ARONOWITZ: Turning to page 6.

16 JUDGE CHACHKIN: All right.

17 BY MR. ARONOWITZ:

18 Q Mr. Werlinger, are the correct coordinates for the
19 Bay City site contained here on page 6?

20 A They are -- they are not.

21 Q Okay. Is there any -- okay, so turning to page
22 7 --

23 A If I might note, however, Mr. Aronowitz, that this
24 is a portion of a 250,000 USGS quadrangle. And if you will
25 note, this is not a real good copy here, but if you will

1 note you will see about -- coming from left to right about
2 two-thirds over on the page if you will see just across from
3 where it says "Proposed STA site," you will see a line drawn
4 from the top of the page to just below that site, and you
5 will see coordinates 95 30 00, and if you will come
6 diagonally to that point, below that you will see north
7 latitude 29 30 00.

8 Q Okay.

9 A So and FCC engineer could easily triangulate from
10 those two points and determine that the coordinates were
11 those of the STA site.

12 Q That may be true, Mr. Werlinger, but on this
13 application does it show the authorized site at Bay City --

14 A Yes, sir.

15 Q -- on this page?

16 A Well, not on this page, sir, but on another page
17 it does.

18 Q Okay. That would be page 7?

19 A Yes, sir.

20 Q And you have the current -- and I'm resuming you
21 are referencing that bottom --

22 A KFCC is the former KIOX.

23 Q Right.

24 A When this STA application was presented, the call
25 sign KFCC had not been approved.

1 Q But there are no coordinates here?

2 A Again, sir, the triangulations, you see 29
3 degrees, 30 degrees.

4 Q I see that.

5 A Thirty-one degrees, 95 degrees, 96 degrees, 97
6 degrees.

7 Q Mr. Werlinger, is there something here that says
8 the current site and gives the coordinates for those sites,
9 I mean, other than finding them on the map?

10 A Does not, sir.

11 Q So there is nothing here that indicates that the
12 coordinates specified in page 3, which you term the "in
13 error" coordinates would be the Bay City site?

14 A No, sir, they are not on there.

15 Q So on the face of this -- all right, let's turn to
16 page 8 of that exhibit.

17 A Again, I might add, though, that this is a routine
18 AM branch exhibit --

19 Q Mr. Werlinger, I am going to object and ask you to
20 just be responsive to my questions. When you get to that, I
21 just want to make sure --

22 A One moment please.

23 (Pause.)

24 BY MR. ARONOWITZ:

25 Q All right, so there is -- on the face of the 4-21

1 STA, there was an error, and the coordinates for the Bay
2 City site really weren't given.

3 A No, sir, they were not.

4 Q Such that if one were reading this for
5 coordinates, it would appear that you were trying to
6 construct an STA at your authorized site in Bay City?

7 A Which, of course, one would never ask to do.

8 Q That's not what I'm asking.

9 From the face of it, it looked as though you were
10 trying to put an STA on your authorized site?

11 A There was one typographical error ever --

12 JUDGE CHACHKIN: You have to answer the question,
13 Mr. Werlinger. You can explain it afterwards, but answer
14 the question.

15 THE WITNESS: It would depend on who was reading
16 it, I guess, Your Honor.

17 BY MR. ARONOWITZ:

18 Q But from the face if this there is nothing on the
19 coordinates that would suggest --

20 A I will say to you that the coordinates of the
21 licensed site are not contained within the documentation of
22 this STA request.

23 Q Okay. Let us turn, and just to pursue this
24 because I really want to let you explain this, I would like
25 you to turn to -- I would like you to turn to Mass Media

1 Bureau Exhibit 18. And this purports to be the amended STA
2 request; is that correct?

3 A Yes, sir.

4 Q Okay. And this is a two-page document consisting
5 of a cover memo, a facsimile cover sheet, and a new Exhibit
6 E-1, if you will.

7 A Yes, sir.

8 Q And this one reflects an existing tower -- excuse
9 me. Now I'm confused.

10 In the May 2, 1995, STA, amended STA request, did
11 you make any mention of the authorized site, the correct
12 coordinates for the authorized site?

13 A I did not, sir.

14 Q Did you make any mention that the authorized
15 coordinates reflected in the 4-21-95 STA were incorrect vis-
16 a-vis the authorized site?

17 A No, sir, I did not.

18 At the time I was unaware that I had made the
19 mistake.

20 Q So on the May 5 -- the May 2nd STA request you
21 have a proposed site -- on page 2, you have coordinates that
22 reflecting the proposed site in 4-21?

23 A Right.

24 Q Okay. And you had an existing -- and you have on
25 here a, or is there on here a depiction if an existing 180-

1 foot tower?

2 A Exhibit E-1, page 1, which is the second page.

3 Q Correct.

4 A Depicts an existing tower.

5 Q Okay. And that has an existing tower with
6 different coordinates from the proposed site; is that
7 correct, as reflected on this STA?

8 A That is correct.

9 Q So reading this one would view a --

10 A A distance of 250 feet.

11 Q But a different site?

12 A Indeed.

13 Q Okay.

14 A Well, not a different site, but a different
15 location within a site.

16 Q Different coordinates?

17 A Different coordinates.

18 Q Okay. And in 4-21-95 -- in the 4-21-95 STA as
19 filed with the coordinates proposed -- if I might strike
20 that, and I want to go in a different direction for a
21 moment.

22 MR. ARONOWITZ: Excuse me just a second.

23 (Pause.)

24 MR. ARONOWITZ: I'll just be a second, Mr.
25 Werlinger.

1 (Pause.)

2 BY MR. ARONOWITZ:

3 Q On the April 21, 1995, STA request you made no
4 mention of the loss of the site, any specifics of the loss
5 of the site; is that correct?

6 A That's correct, sir.

7 Q You just said that the site was lost?

8 A Due to the loss of the site.

9 Q Due to the loss of the site.

10 And you have stated here, and in fact you state in
11 Exhibit 1 that there really was no emergency or condemnation
12 or other natural type of act that made the authorized site
13 unusable?

14 A No, sir, I made no such statement, nor was I
15 asked.

16 Q That's fine.

17 And in fact you acknowledge that it was caused by
18 the contractual obligations.

19 A Yes, sir.

20 Q And in fact you really did not ever address the
21 circumstances of the lost site --

22 A My experience --

23 Q -- at that time in the STA request, in either of
24 the STA requests?

25 A That is correct, sir. My experience had been that

1 the question had never come up in any STA requests that I
2 had ever been involved in before.

3 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Well, you made a statement here
4 that you currently operate from a licensed site.

5 Did you in fact currently operate from a licensed
6 site?

7 THE WITNESS: As of the 20th of April, sir, I did
8 not. We had -- again, we had taken the station dark at that
9 point.

10 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Well, you never operated from a
11 licensed site, did you? You never operated the station --

12 THE WITNESS: As a licensee, I as the licensee,
13 no.

14 JUDGE CHACHKIN: But you made the statement that
15 you currently operate from a licensed site, and due to its
16 loss of its currently licensed site.

17 Now, doesn't that imply that you originally
18 operated or that you currently operate a licensed site, and
19 now you've lost that licensed site?

20 Now, is that a truthful statement in fact?

21 THE WITNESS: Well, under the terms of the
22 contract, Your Honor, yes, it was.

23 JUDGE CHACHKIN: I'm not asking about the terms of
24 the contract. I'm asking what you told the Commission. You
25 told the Commission that you currently operate from a

1 licensed site. Now, you told me that you never operated
2 from a licensed site. So that was not a truthful statement
3 that you currently operated from a licensed site, was it?

4 THE WITNESS: Well, I guess it -- I didn't look at
5 it that way, Your Honor. The station had operated until
6 that point from that site.

7 JUDGE CHACHKIN: But you under your tutelage never
8 operated from that site?

9 THE WITNESS: That is correct, sir.

10 JUDGE CHACHKIN: So if you never had a site, how
11 could you say you lost a site?

12 THE WITNESS: Well, Your Honor, the --

13 JUDGE CHACHKIN: If you never operated from that
14 site, how can you say that you lost your currently licensed
15 site?

16 THE WITNESS: Well, actually, Your Honor, the --
17 under the strict interpretation -- in my understanding I
18 guess is the better word, under my understanding of the
19 Commission's rules that is the station's licensed site until
20 a construction permit is granted, constructed, a 302 is
21 submitted and approved, and a new licensed site is licensed.
22 So irrespective of whether -- again, this is my
23 understanding of the rules -- irrespective of whether I'm
24 operating on an STA or not, that site remains the radio
25 station's licensed site.

1 Does that make sense?

2 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Well, it says that, "Due to its
3 loss of its currently licensed site, Chameleon Radio
4 Corporation, licensee of KIOX, applied for as of April 21,
5 1995" --

6 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

7 JUDGE CHACHKIN: "...respectfully requests
8 authority to operate from an alternate site.

9 Now, my question is if you never operated in the
10 first place from the licensed site, then how do you make the
11 statement that you lost your licensed site?

12 THE WITNESS: Well, I --

13 JUDGE CHACHKIN: I mean, is that a truthful
14 statement, if you never operated to say that you lost your
15 licensed site?

16 THE WITNESS: Well, again, Your Honor, today the
17 Commission's database refers to that Bay City site as the
18 licensed site.

19 JUDGE CHACHKIN: But Chameleon never operated from
20 there.

21 THE WITNESS: Well, not at that time, no.

22 JUDGE CHACHKIN: It never operated from there at
23 any time.

24 THE WITNESS: Well, it does today.

25 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Oh, it does today.

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.

2 JUDGE CHACHKIN: Not at the time you asked for the
3 STA?

4 THE WITNESS: Not at the time of the STA, that's
5 correct.

6 (Pause.)

7 BY MR. ARONOWITZ:

8 Q Okay, so, in fact, none of this was disclosed in
9 the STA that when you took over the station you took it dark
10 and you were not operating, none of that was disclosed?

11 A It was not.

12 Q And did you -- in the STA -- before I go to that,
13 Mr. Werlinger, in your experience you stated that you filed
14 a number of STAs in the past?

15 A Yes, sir.

16 Q To your knowledge, is city-grade coverage required
17 for the issuance of an STA?

18 A It was my experience that it was routinely waived.

19 Q But at least to ask for a waiver, it was at least
20 a requirement that there be city-grade service; is that
21 correct, in an STA?

22 A Actually, Mr. Aronowitz, it was my routine
23 practice to provide far more documentation that was required
24 in asking for an STA, including maps of contours and so
25 forth.

1 Q Mr. Werlinger, that may --

2 A So I did not --

3 Q -- be the case, but I am going to ask you a very
4 specific question.

5 A I was unaware that there was a specific
6 requirement that an STA put a city-grade contour over the
7 city of license at all times.

8 Q You just said that you knew that it was routinely
9 waived.

10 A I -- I knew that on a routine basis, if the
11 question was brought up, well, this thing doesn't put a five
12 millivolt or in the case of an FM -- actually, I have never
13 applied for an FM STA so I don't know how they act. But if
14 the question was ever raised, you simply say it's an STA,
15 and it's waived. It was a non -- it was a non-issue in
16 every other STA I had ever filed for.

17 Q I'm going to ask you again, and I'm going to ask
18 you to please try to stay with the answer and answer the
19 specific question.

20 Did you understand that city-grade coverage was
21 required for an STA?

22 A I understood it. I also understood that it was
23 routinely a waived issue.

24 Q All right. So you understood there was a
25 requirement for city-grade coverage in an STA?

1 A Yes, sir.

2 Q Okay. Did the 4-21 STA request disclose a lack of
3 city-grade coverage to Bay City?

4 A It very clearly on the map showing the five
5 millivolt contour did not include the City of Bay City.

6 Q In your recitation, in your narrative, in anywhere
7 was it explained that there would not be city-grade
8 coverage?

9 A No, it was not.

10 Q So, in other words, the only way to determine the
11 city-grade coverage is to take your maps and kind of review
12 them --

13 A To do what the --

14 Q -- and figure out what it mean?

15 A To do what the Commission staff does.

16 Q And ultimately the Commission staff did in this
17 case; is that correct?

18 A Well, I think -- I think they did it initially as
19 well because the STA was granted.

20 Q And the STA was subsequently rescinded the first
21 time.

22 A That is correct.

23 Q And why was it subsequently rescinded, to your
24 knowledge?

25 A Well, I got a series of telephone calls from Mr.

1 Vu.

2 Q Mr. Werlinger, I am going to excuse you, and I'm
3 going to ask you to look at -- excuse me, I just want to
4 find it.

5 I'm going to ask you to refer to -- oh, that's our
6 exhibit. I am going to ask you to turn to Mass Media
7 Exhibit 10. It's a May 18 letter rescinding the STA.

8 Does this letter give a reason for the recision?

9 A Yes, it does.

10 Q And what is that?

11 A It says, "Further study of your STA request
12 reveals that KIOX(AM) does not cover the city of license,
13 Bay City, Texas, from the proposed transmitter site in
14 contravention of Section 73.24(i) of the Rules."

15 Q Okay. So, in fact -- so going back, the 4-21 STA
16 and the 5-2 amendment did not disclose the lack of city-
17 grade in the narrative; is that correct?

18 A That's correct, sir.

19 Q And that essentially the Commission subsequently
20 rescinded it for lack of city-grade coverage to Bay City; is
21 that correct?

22 A That is the written reason, yes.

23 Q Okay. We'll get there.

24 Did the STA request, the 4-12 STA request, or the
25 5-2 amended STA request, did that disclose on the face of

1 those applications that you would be moving -- that it was
2 your intention to move the community of license to Houston?

3 A It was only referenced -- let's get back to it.

4 I'm sorry, what was the --

5 Q It was -- Exhibit 6 if the 4-21.

6 A The amended was 18.

7 Q And 18 is the 5-2 amendment. And I will try to be
8 clearer on that.

9 A The narrative on the 5-2 amendment says, "The
10 tower in our original proposal will be the center tower of
11 what will be a three-tower array. Again, we will have a
12 Form 301 to you within 30 days of placing the STA on the
13 air. All we need is the time to take some readings off the
14 STA site in order to properly design the pattern."

15 I had discussed with Mr. Vu in detail the fact
16 that we intended to change the city of license; that the new
17 city of license would be probably Missouri City, as in fact
18 it turned out to be, and he was well aware of the fact that
19 we intended to change the city of license as part of the
20 301.

21 Q But that's not contained in this application. I
22 mean, none of that was reflected or set forth in the 4-21-95
23 STA request.

24 A No, sir, and I don't know of any rule that would
25 require it.

1 Q Just want to make sure that I didn't overlook
2 something.

3 A But Mr. Vu was verbally made very well aware of
4 the fact that we intended to change the city of license on
5 the radio station.

6 Q That's correct. That's what you say and I have no
7 problem with that. But I am now focusing on the 4-21 STA
8 and there is nothing here --

9 A There is nothing that refers to --

10 Q -- that reflects the fact that it would be this
11 STA that would effectuate the change. In other words, that
12 you would then be serving -- that you would then be
13 operating from Harris County and serving another community
14 of license, in essence, because you wouldn't be serving Bay
15 City.

16 A Well, in point of fact the Harris County site with
17 1,000 watts placed better than two millivolts over --

18 Q Is that required city-grade coverage?

19 A It is not, sir, but it is substantial coverage.
20 The radio station could very easily be heard on an in-home
21 inexpensive radio at Bay City.

22 Q To your knowledge, do the Commission's rule
23 require that city-grade coverage to the community of
24 license?

25 A It does, and it is routinely waived.

1 Q Would that have been the community of -- the
2 requisition community of license?

3 A It would have been substantially -- it would have
4 been referred to as substantial coverage.

5 Q But it would not be the requisite city-grade
6 signal to Bay City?

7 A It would not, sir.

8 Q And, again, there is nothing in here reflecting
9 the fact that it is -- this STA or the 301 that might be
10 filed -- let me strike that.

11 There is nothing on the face of the 4-21 STA or
12 the 5-2 amended STA that reflect that this STA would
13 effectuate the community of license change for all intents
14 and purposes?

15 A Those -- using your words, no.

16 Q Using any other words would there have been any
17 other --

18 A Well, you say effectuate the community of license
19 change.

20 Q Well, it -- all right.

21 Although you did not -- in the 4-21 STA request or
22 the 5-2 amended you didn't -- I think, if I understand your
23 testimony, you didn't disclose the circumstances of the lost
24 site. You just said you lost it.

25 A The subject was never brought up, Mr. Aronowitz.

1 Nobody ever --

2 Q Do you know when the subject, if ever, was brought
3 up?

4 A I beg your pardon?

5 Q Do you know when the subject was, if ever, brought
6 up?

7 A I think it was formally broached in the letter of
8 July 25th. However, in both my conversations with Messrs.
9 Burtle and Eads, I very clearly laid out the entirety of the
10 situation. And those two meetings occurred --

11 Q Did you tell them that -- when you say -- prior
12 to --

13 A I met with Mr Burtle on the 23rd of May, and Mr.
14 Eads on the 25th.

15 Q And at that time did you discuss the site loss?

16 A Yes.

17 MR. ARONOWITZ: One second.

18 (Pause.)

19 BY MR. ARONOWITZ:

20 Q I'm going to ask you to refer to your -- well, no,
21 it's my statement. I'm going to ask you to turn to Mass
22 Media Exhibit 7. And I'm going to ask -- are you there?

23 A Yes, sir.

24 Q Mass Media Bureau Exhibit 7. I'm going to ask you
25 to look down the page to No. 4.

1 A Yes, sir.

2 Q Could you read that, please?

3 A "Part of Chameleon's application for the STA state
4 that it lost its transmitter site. That statement was true
5 and there was no intention on my part to evade or
6 misrepresent any facts to the FCC. The site loss was
7 involuntary."

8 Q All right. And this is -- and I orient myself.
9 This is the first time that you advised the Commission in
10 writing that the site loss was "involuntary," is that
11 correct?

12 A I think that's the first time that I in writing
13 used the word "involuntary." I meant it in reference to my
14 contractual obligations.

15 Q I understand.

16 A I mean it today. I believe it was involuntary.

17 Q We will get there. We will get there, absolutely.

18 And I think, just to skip a lot of questions, I
19 think you testified that the site loss was in fact a
20 contractual one.

21 A That's right.

22 Q There is no act of God or anything like that?

23 A No, sir.

24 Q And that the contract that you refer to, the
25 contractual loss, was when you acquired the station?

1 A Yes, sir.

2 Q And at that time you had no intention of occupying
3 the Bay City site; is that correct?

4 A That is correct, sir.

5 Q And I believe you testified a few minutes ago that
6 at the time of this deal, your acquisition of KFCC, the
7 previous licensee wished to retain access to their
8 transmitter;

9 A Well, access to the studio facilities.

10 Q To the studio facilities.

11 A Their transmitter location is separate from that
12 site.

13 Q And when you acquired KFCC, you acquired this
14 property that is the subject of the lease and the leaseback
15 and so on and so forth; is that correct?

16 A The original licensee who had sold the radio
17 station but not the property had a lease that they -- you
18 know, they leased the land upon which the building, which
19 was owned and the towers and so forth, back to the radio
20 station.

21 Q So Mr. Landrum, who was in essence the previously
22 licensee --

23 A Yes.

24 Q -- had, he was just a leaseholder on that land.
25 He didn't own the land?

1 A He did not own the land.

2 Q When you acquired KFCC --

3 A He wished to remain on the land though.

4 Q He wished to remain on the land.

5 A Right.

6 Q But in order for this deal to go through he had to
7 assign -- initially he had to assign his leasehold back to
8 you?

9 A That is correct.

10 Q Okay.

11 A Which I then leased back to him.

12 Q We will get there.

13 And at that time he wished to retain access to the
14 land, to the property?

15 A Yes, sir.

16 Q And at that time you gave him a leaseback?

17 A Yes, sir.

18 Q And with that leaseback there was nothing that --
19 strike that.

20 You leased back Mr. Landrum an ability to get on
21 that property?

22 A Use of the property.

23 Q Use of the property.

24 A Quiet enjoyment thereof I think is how it's
25 worded.